**President Lyndon Johnson's Defense of the U.S. Presence in Vietnam (1965)**

*In July 1965 U.S. involvement in Vietnam was escalating. That month, President Johnson had approved an immediate increase in American troop strength to 125,000, with a commitment to raise that number to 200,000 by year’s end. But the speech that Johnson gave to defend his actions in Vietnam was not delivered to Congress, nor was it a prime-time television event. Rather, it was given at a press conference and, according to Johnson’s advisers in later interviews, was meant to be as “low-key” as possible.*

. . . Three times in my lifetime, in two world wars and in Korea, Americans have gone to far lands to fight for freedom. We have learned at a terrible and brutal cost that retreat does not bring safety and weakness does not bring peace.

It is this lesson that has brought us to Viet-Nam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Viet-Nam, at times with understandable grievances, have joined in the attack on their own government.

But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war. It is guided by North Viet-Nam, and it is spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the South, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic dominion of communism.

There are great stakes in the balance.

Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves and alone, resist the growing might and the grasping ambition of Asian Communism.

Our power, therefore, is a very vital shield. If we are driven from the field in Viet-Nam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promise or in American protection.

In each land the forces of independence would be considerably weakened and an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would certainly imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else.

Nor would surrender in Viet-Nam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history.

Moreover, we are in Viet-Nam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American nation. Three Presidents--President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President--over 11 years have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation.

Strengthened by that promise, the people of South Viet-Nam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We just cannot now dishonor our word, or abandon our commitment, or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow.

This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Viet-Nam.

**Document Analysis**

1. Can you summarize Johnson’s defense of U.S. policy in Vietnam in a single sentence? What are his main reasons for continuing U.S. involvement?
2. What does Johnson predict would happen if the United States pulled out of Vietnam?
3. How does Johnson’s explanation of U.S. involvement in Vietnam compare to George W. Bush’s explanation of U.S. involvement in Afghanistan and Iraq?